



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 10/674,965 | 09/30/2003 | David Bruce Kumhyr | AUS920030728US1 | 4947 |
| 35525 | 7590 | 07/23/2009 | | |
| IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380 | | | EXAMINER BOYCE, ANDRE D | |
| | | | ART UNIT 3623 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE 07/23/2009 | DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeciplay.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/674,965

Applicant(s)

KUMHYR ET AL.

Examiner

Andre Boyce

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Final office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed March 12, 2009. Claims 1-22 have been amended and are pending.
2. The previously pending objections to the drawings have been withdrawn.
The previously pending objections to the specification have been withdrawn.
The previously pending objection to claim 1 has been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments filed March 12, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11, 13-16, 18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingham et al (US 2002/0069094), in view of Okawa (USPN 5,933,810).

As per claim 1, Bingham et al disclose a method in a data processing system for reallocating meeting room resources (i.e., a system for reserving resources for a

meeting, ¶ 0008), the method comprising: providing a database of meeting room resources, wherein the meeting room resources in the database include assigned attributes (i.e., meeting facility criteria including meeting room resources, ¶ 0029); receiving a first request from a user, wherein the first request includes a first criteria of desired attributes (i.e., reservation request for a meeting package, ¶ 0029); determining whether a meeting room resource matching the first criteria of desired attributes is available (i.e., availability of each of the meeting facility resources is determined, ¶ 0031); and responsive to a determination that the meeting room resource matching the first criteria of desired attributes is unavailable (i.e., meeting facility is unavailable, ¶ 0036), presenting to the user a first set of reserved meeting room resources that match the first criteria of desired attributes (i.e., booked meeting rooms, figure 13).

Bingham et al does not explicitly disclose identifying a second set of substitute meeting room resources that match a second criteria of desired attributes that was requested by a reserving party of a reserved meeting room resource: sending a notification to the reserving party that the user is requesting release of a reserved meeting room resource; tracking notifications that have been received; and responsive to the reserved meeting room resource being released, reallocating the reserved meeting room resource to the user.

Okawa discloses if vacant time does not exist in step S3, an arrangement is required to be made between the current reservation (duplicate reservation) which is duplicated with the requested reservation for the same time, as the requested reservation (i.e., meeting room resources that match a second criteria of desired

attributes that was requested by a reserving party of a reserved meeting room resource), wherein the CPU 11 calculates the degrees of importance of the requirements of the requested reservation in step S8, and then calculates the degree of importance of the duplicate reservation in step S9, and a calculation of the degree of importance of the duplicate reservation is executed for all of the reservations made in the allowable date range described in the requirements of the reservation (column 8, lines 6-16). In addition, Okawa discloses if the current reservation whose degree of importance is lower than that of the newly-requested reservation is included in duplicate reservations in step S10, the value 1 is added to the number of reservation changes made to the current reservation in step S15. Then, the current reservation is replaced with the reservation being processed in step S16 (i.e., responsive to the reserved meeting room resource being released, reallocating the reserved meeting room resource to the user). That is, on the date and time when the current reservation with a lower importance degree was arranged, the newly-requested reservation is arranged instead (column 9, lines 35-43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include identifying a second set of substitute meeting room resources that match a second criteria of desired attributes that was requested by a reserving party of a reserved meeting room resource: sending a notification to the reserving party that the user is requesting release of a reserved meeting room resource; tracking notifications that have been received; and responsive to the reserved meeting room resource being released, reallocating the reserved

meeting room in Bingham et al, as seen in Okawa, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 2, Bingham et al disclose a room capacity (i.e., desired number of meeting rooms) and a location (i.e., geographic location, ¶ 0034).

As per claim 4, Bingham et al disclose transmitting the first set of reserved meeting room resources to a client computer, wherein the first set of reserved meeting room resources are displayed to the user at the client computer (i.e., the meeting facility's inventory data is displayed to the user, ¶ 0033 and figure 4).

As per claim 6, Bingham et al do not disclose responsive to a selection of the reserved meeting room resource from the first set of reserved meeting room resources by the user, determining whether the user has priority over the reserving party of the reserved meeting room resource; and responsive to the user having priority over the reserving party and responsive to the user selecting the reserved meeting room resource that has been previously allocated to the reserving party, reallocating the reserved meeting room resource to the user. Okawa teaches assigning and determining a priority for users making reservations (column 1, lines 14-18, lines 34-39, lines 47-51, column 2, lines 65-67, column 5, lines 14-17) and replacing the reservation to the user having higher priority (i.e. degree of importance) (column 9, lines 35-43, column 10, lines 17-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include determining whether the

user has priority over the reserving party of the reserved meeting room resource; and responsive to the user having priority over the reserving party and responsive to the user selecting the reserved meeting room resource that has been previously allocated to the reserving party, reallocating the reserved meeting room resource to the user in Bingham et al, as seen in Okawa, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 7, Bingham et al does not disclose responsive to a reallocation of the reserved meeting room resource to the user, sending the reserving party a notification of the reallocation. Okawa teaches sending a notification (i.e. electronic mail) informing the person who made the reservation and others (column 9, lines 56-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include responsive to a reallocation of the reserved meeting room resource to the user, sending the reserving party a notification of the reallocation in Bingham et al, as seen in Okawa, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Claims 8, 9, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected based upon the same rationale as the rejections of claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7, respectively, since they are the data processing system claims corresponding to the method claims.

Claims 15, 16, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected based upon the same rationale as the rejections of claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7, respectively, since they are the computer program product claims corresponding to the method claims.

Claim 22 is rejected based upon the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1, since it is the data processing system claim corresponding to the method claim.

6. Claims 3, 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingham et al (US 2002/0069094), in view of Okawa (USPN 5,933,810), in further view of Ralston et al (US 2003/0005055).

As per claim 3, neither Bingham et al nor Okawa disclose a white board, a conference phone, wired network connections, wireless network connections, an overhead projector, and a podium. Ralston et al teaches attributes (i.e. services) to include room requirements, facility capability stipulations and equipments (§ [0028], lines 1-5, § [0031], lines 18-20, § [0037], lines 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include room requirements, facility capability stipulations and equipments in Bingham et al, as seen in Ralston et al, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Claim 10 is rejected based upon the same rationale as the rejection of claim 3, since it is the data processing system claim corresponding to the method claim.

Claim 17 is rejected based upon the same rationale as the rejections of claim 3, since it is the computer program product claim corresponding to the method claim.

7. Claims 5, 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingham et al (US 2002/0069094), in view of Okawa (USPN 5,933,810), in further view of Vossler (USPN 6,614,450).

As per claim 5, neither Bingham et al nor Okawa explicitly disclose responsive to a selection of a reserved meeting room resource from the first set of reserved meeting room resources, presenting contact information for the reserving party of the reserved meeting room resource. Vossler teaches displaying information regarding room usage (column 5, lines 24-30, lines 47-50, column 6, lines 15-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include presenting contact information for the reserving party of the reserved meeting room resource in Bingham et al, as seen in Vossler, since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Claim 12 is rejected based upon the same rationale as the rejection of claim 5, since it is the data processing system claim corresponding to the method claim.

Claim 19 is rejected based upon the same rationale as the rejections of claim 5, since it is the computer program product claim corresponding to the method claim.

Response to Arguments

8. In the Remarks, with respect to independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 22, Applicant argues none of the cited prior art teach or suggest the features of 1) identifying a second set of substitute meeting room resources that match a second criteria of desired attributes that was requested by a reserving party of a reserved meeting room resource, 2) sending a notification to the reserving party that the user is requesting release of a reserved meeting room resource, and 3) reallocating the reserved meeting room resource to the user in response to the reserved meeting room resource being released. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed supra, in the rejection of claim 1, Okawa indeed discloses the limitations.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre Boyce whose telephone number is (571)272-6726. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6pm M-F. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andre Boyce/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623
July 18, 2009